

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2883) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 252, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1200

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2883, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2883, the Clerk be authorized to make such technical and conforming changes as necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill (H.R. 2883) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 248 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2646.

□ 1200

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011, with Mr. LAHOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, October 4, 2001, amendment No. 34 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) had been withdrawn.

Pursuant to the order of the House of that day, no further amendment may be offered except one pro forma amendment each offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture or their designees for the purpose of debate.

There being no further amendments in order under the order of the House, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, during my service in Congress, I have consistently opposed agricultural welfare programs. This Farm Bill, for the most part, represents business-as-usual for our nation's heavily-subsidized farmers. It's unfortunate to know that at a time of such advances in every other area of our lives, our agriculture sector has all the sophistication of a Soviet commune.

But there is something to smile about, because this Farm Bill contains one vital reform: the abolition of the federal peanut quota program. This program is truly a relic of the Great Depression, and today it's put on notice that its days are numbered.

The General Accounting Office has found the peanut program provides substantial benefits to a small number of producers who hold most of the quota, restricts peanut production by other farmers, and increases consumer costs by between \$300 million and \$500 million annually.

For years, I've had a hard time understanding why our government favors one group of American peanut farmers—those who own quotas—over other American farmers who don't own this privilege. This program harms so many for the benefit of such a select few.

My partner in reform, Congressman PAUL KANJORSKI, and I have always maintained that it was not our intention to pull the rug out from under our nation's peanut farmers. Rather, our goal has always been to bring peanuts in line with other commodities, and the legislation we introduced replaced quota restrictions with the same non-recourse loan system enjoyed by other commodities.

Some of my colleagues may be concerned with the Farm Bill's approach, which shifts the burden from consumers to taxpayers.

I agree this compromise isn't perfect, but it does meet two essential criteria we've set for

reform. First, and most important, it repeals the quota system. This is the key to making the peanut industry more market-oriented, providing a level playing field for farmers, and promoting international trade.

Second, as GAO confirmed in correspondence I will submit for the record, this bill "Would essentially bring the peanut program in line with other commodity programs."

Why is this important? Because taking peanuts off a separate track will ultimately make it easier to enact future reforms. It also exposes the hidden costs of the existing program by putting it "on the books."

There are still some concerns I have with what we're accomplishing today. First, this legislation compensates quota holders for the loss of their asset, which I must confess I think is fair. While those of us who want reform are willing to accept this provision, it is only under the understanding that the Chairman shares our commitment to let it expire after five years specified in this bill.

Second, at a cost of \$3.5 billion over 10 years, these reforms will come at some expense. With a rapidly shrinking budget surplus and tremendous needs in other areas, we are going to have to reexamine whether this is the best use of taxpayers' dollars.

Finally, I'm concerned about findings by the GAO that several of the new subsidies for peanuts may be identified as "trade distorting" under the 1994 Uruguay Round of trade talks. If we expect other nations to lower their trade barriers, we need to ensure we're not erecting barriers of our own.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of debate on this bill, I'm going to continue to express reservations about our overall agriculture policy. But at this moment, I want to commend the Chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. COMBEST, for bringing us closer that we've ever been to ending the Byzantine system of price supports for peanuts.

I would also request unanimous consent to submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a September 26 letter from the General Accounting Office reviewing the peanut title of this Farm Bill.

UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING
OFFICE,

Washington, DC, September 26, 2001.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS,
House of Representatives.

Hon. PAUL E. KANJORSKI,
House of Representatives.

Subject: Peanut Program: Potential Effects of Proposed Farm Bill on Producers, Consumers, Government, and Peanut Imports and Exports.

The current federal peanut program, administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), is designed to support producers' incomes while ensuring an ample supply of domestically produced peanuts. To accomplish these goals, the program controls the domestic supply of peanuts and guarantees producers a minimum price for their crops. This price substantially exceeds the price of peanuts in world markets. The program uses two mechanisms to control the domestic supply of peanuts: (1) a national quota on the number of pounds that can be sold for edible consumption domestically and (2) import restrictions. While anyone can grow peanuts, only producers holding quota, either through ownership or rental of farmland, may sell their peanuts domestically, as "quota" peanuts. Generally, all other production, referred to as "additional" peanuts, must be exported or crushed for oil and meal.